

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,975	10/05/2005	Robert S. Meissner	20880P	3364
210 75	590 11/15/2006		EXAMINER	
MERCK AND CO., INC			RAMACHANDRAN, UMAMAHESWARI	
P O BOX 2000 RAHWAY, NJ 07065-0907			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			1617	
			DATE MAILED: 11/15/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/551,975	MEISSNER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Umamaheswari Ramachandran	1617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING [In the state of th	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 (2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under 	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-18 are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the bedrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ction is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received in Application (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) \(\sum \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te	

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-18 are pending and claims 19-21 are cancelled.

Lack of Unity

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1-13, are drawn to method for modulating androgen receptor comprising administering a therapeutically effective amount of a compound of structural formula I (claim 1) and a bone-strengthening agent.

Group II, claims 14-15 are drawn to a compound of structural formula I.

Group III, claims 16-18 are drawn to a composition comprising a compound of structural formula I and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and a bone-strengthening agent.

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features.

An international application should relate to only one invention or, if there is more than one invention, the inclusion of those inventions in one international application is only permitted if all inventions are so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (PCT Rule 13.1). With respect to a group of inventions claimed in an

Application/Control Number: 10/551,975

Art Unit: 1617

international application, unity of invention exists only when there is a technical relationship among the claimed inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

The expression "special technical features" is defined in PCT Rule 13.2 as meaning those technical features that define a contribution which each of the inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. The determination is made on the contents of the claims as interpreted in light of the description and drawings (if any). Whether or not any particular technical feature makes a "contribution" over the prior art, and therefore constitutes a "special technical feature", should be considered with respect to novelty and inventive step.

The common technical feature in all the groups is a compound of structural formula I. This cannot be a special technical feature under PCT Rule 13.2 because it is shown in the prior art. Li et al. (J. Med. Chem, Vol. 38, pp 1158-1173, 1995) teaches a number of 17β -(N-alkyl/arylformamido)- and 17β [(N-alkyl/aryl)alkyl/arylamido]-3-oxo-4-aza- 5α -steroids as inhibitors of human 5α -reductase and antagonists of the androgen receptor (see Abstract). As a result, no special technical features exist among the different groups because the inventions in Groups I-III fail to make a contribution over the prior art with respect to novelty or inventive step. In conclusion, there is lack of unity of inventions, and therefore restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims

Art Unit: 1617

subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election. If group I is elected for restriction purposes the applicant is required to elect a single species from claims 1, 2, 5 and 7-11. If group II is elected for restriction purposes the applicant is required to elect a single species from claims 14 and 15. If group III is elected for restriction purposes the applicant is required to elect a single species from claim 17.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.1.43).

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly

Art Unit: 1617

and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

A telephone call to the attorney is not required where 1) the restriction requirement is complex, 2) the application is being prosecuted pro se, or 3) the examiner knows from past experience that a telephone election will not be made (MPEP § 812.01). Therefore, since the examiner knows from past experience that written restriction is preferred, a telephone election was not made.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umamaheswari Ramachandran whose telephone number is 571-272-9926. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/551,975

Art Unit: 1617

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SREENI PADMANABHAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER